

From: rkasting@dsscorp.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/7/01 12:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Anti-Trust Case

This is my opinion and not necessarily that of my employer or anyone else.

I don't think Microsoft has been properly dealt with and I think that it was too late before the proceeding even started.

It's quite obvious that they dominate the desktop computing environment. Go to 98+% of computer resellers and you only have Microsoft options for your OS. They did so by cheating other vendors in any way they could. Just look at the way they cheated IBM with the OS/2 project. You can find all sorts of things that they've done to cheat people. And every time they hide behind their no-warranty policies, their attorneys, and their desire to destroy their competition.

They have hurt the consumer because they choose not to introduce new innovations. I had a decent speech-recognition package on my PC back before Windows was out. They have squelched folks with this and other innovations for years to the degree that decent speech-recognition for a reasonable price still doesn't really exist. Essentially, all they've done for several releases of their products is provide the same functionality with a different look. Not only that, but they drop support on the older versions, forcing you to upgrade to newer versions for support and forcing you to replace hardware that shouldn't need replacing. They have essentially made everyone's expensive computers a 3 year disposable asset. I think surprises most consumers and they don't realize they've been had until it's too late. Only a major monopoly can force people to buy newer products.

They've also reigned in an era where software vendors demand licenses for each individual person using a system. I don't have to buy seat licenses for my car. Why should I have to buy seat licenses for my network? They've twisted the purpose of copyright laws to the point that people don't even consider that they shouldn't have to pay for some of these licenses. I think the government has a lot of work to do to make certain that copyright laws are not abused by companies like Microsoft. I would like to point out that much of the software industry is like this.

They bring litigation unfairly to their customers. They sell their products with poor descriptions of what the licensing requirements even are. Many customers don't properly understand their complicated licensing methods. I believe it's part of their strategy. Once the systems are in place and folks use them every day, Microsoft can pry money out of the company's hand after the fact. They use the court system to generate a profit. Shouldn't they be considered a 'vexant claimant'. They should be required to verify that folks understand their licensing in some way other

than a silly prompt that comes up during the install of their OS. In addition, if that is where they choose to put the agreement, you should be able to return the product after the box is opened. You can't look at any of their licensing agreements for which you would disagree without opening the box.

In addition, they've reigned in an era of no responsibility to the consumer. If 1000 people bought lawn-mowers that broke every 4 hours, the people would file a class-action suite and win. For some reason, Microsoft is allowed to provide no warranty whatsoever. Folks at home just can't get things fixed. They pawn it off on the resellers to support their product. That ridiculous for the amount of money they get for the product. For \$250, I should get silver-platter service when I call them. How many times is someone going to have to pay almost \$250 for Windows 2000 after they've already bought a \$1200 PC and watch it crash once a day? The only reason that they can treat their customers this way is because they are a monopoly.

They've brought about an era where the copyright laws are interpreted to not include the consumer in the considerations. They think that the whole world should have to pay tribute to them for their OS. You can't use a damned PC without an OS. They think that every vendor and every consumer should just have to accept their rule over the market at the prices they want. People with greater innovations don't expect that of the world, why should Microsoft get to pervert the copyright laws to do so?

Finally, they leave all of their customers with huge security issues without provided free and reasonable support. There are typically thousands of security bugs in any release of their OS. They rarely want to admit their faults, so customers are left open to attacks until they admit the faults and fix them. This costs their customers a lot of money to fix, patch and such. For the money you pay, they should do a much better job than they do. Why is it that they can't be held responsible for a breach of security on their product when the product is used properly. If a safe manufacturer sells a safe and it's properly installed and all you have to do is turn the dial any which way to open it, the safe manufacturer should be liable if someone's goods are stolen as a result. Why is Microsoft free of this obligation to their customers? It's not like the product is cheap.

I think Microsoft needs to be forced to be responsible to their customers. They should be required to provide warranty on their products that actually guarantee the working of the product.

They have done more than try to compete over the years. They've been ought right dishonest and unfair. I think that anyone working on this case can see that if they just open their eyes. If the government is not more harsh with Microsoft, I feel that they will not have fulfilled their responsibility in upholding the spirit of the AntiTrust laws.

I apologize for some of my rambling, but I've been in the industry my entire career and I can't stand the fact that a blind eye has been turned to this for so long. We put folks in office to make sure that these sorts of things get addressed properly. Why do we always have to wait until too late to deal with everything? Please go do something about this.